

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—From yesterday you are in a mood to impute motives.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—You should not forget as to what help you got from the Opposition in the Select Committee.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If the Honourable Member yields a minute, I thanked all the Honourable Members on the day I made my concluding speech after the debate. That does not mean that I should accept anything and everything, that the Honourable Members should attribute motives to the Revenue Minister. It is of course open to everybody to attribute motives ; I don't mind.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—We feel honestly that he has been trying to safeguard the vested interests. We attribute that motive to him, but he should not attribute motive to us. We know that he is placed in very peculiar circumstances. At the same time we say that he is incapable of implementing his ideas. If he is incapable of implementing his ideas, if he is not true to conscience, he should quit the Congress Legislature Party and come out.....

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—And join you ?

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—I don't ask you to join us. I know what your views were formerly. I know why this provision has been made in this particular amendment ; with what ulterior motive it has been provided. There was no mention made in the Joint Select Committee Report. We know that some mutt represented that they are personally cultivating thousands of acres of land. Is it possible, when the lands are distributed throughout the district, to cultivate the lands personally. It is to give some exemption for such of those institutions. It may be religious institutions ; it may be charitable institutions, but some of them are institutions which are there just to safeguard certain vested interests. Had he omitted some of these words 'religious institutions' I would not have really opposed it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to draw his attention to item No. 11 : "to cultivate personally" means to cultivate land on one's own account—

- (i) by one's own labour, or
- (ii) by the labour of any member of one's family, or
- (iii) by hired labour or by servants on wages payable in cash or kind....."

Even if that is not added, does it make any difference ?

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—When Mr. Patil insisted that he should put physical labour, Mr. Nagan Gowda said that it is impossible to cultivate even two standard acres.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I would like to know from him whether in the absence of this amendment, it makes any difference. I think it does not make any difference.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Even in the absence of this amendment, if this institution could cultivate personally, then where was the need for this amendment. It is with the definite purpose of safeguarding certain vested interests.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is 'cultivating personally' ?

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—I have discussed this matter several times. I was also a member of the Jatti Committee. I know the implications of these amendments, the implications of this Bill.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (K.G.F.)—Just a point of information. Was this amendment not specifically rejected by the Select Committee.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a confidential thing.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I credibly know that the Select Committee has rejected this very amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not know. I was not a member.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—You may not know. But, when I bring it to your notice, you must consider it. Supposing the Select Committee has rejected an amendment ; is it open to the Government to bring in an amendment here ? You do not allow this to another member.

Mr. SPEAKER.—After all, it is confidential. He cannot ask for that information.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—Sir, with a view to give exemption which are not already exempted, this amendment is brought. Therefore, I oppose this amendment.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, everyday we are being treated with pieces of surprises and shocks. I think the Hon'ble Revenue Minister has become a specialist in shock treatment. I do not know when he joined the ranks of Allopathic or Ayurvedic doctors. In any case, it appears to me that it is a production of a quack. I would like to invite the attention of the House to item 24 of clause 2, wherein 'person' is defined.

“ ‘person’ includes a company, family, association or other body of individuals whether incorporated or not, and any institution capable of holding property.”

I am asking the Revenue Minister whether there was any need for bringing forward this amendment before this House. What is behind the scene, I cannot understand. The definition of 'person' is sufficient as to bring all those institutions.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—This is an explanation.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, yesterday, when I asked to please the explanation for ceiling, the Minister said, there was no necessity for giving an explanation. This kind of a thing should not go on from time to time. I do not know what took place in the Select

Committee nor am I interested to know what it is. But the Revenue Minister's bringing amendment after amendment leads to suspicion that there is something behind the scene and the House is not taken into confidence. This is not an amendment which the House is in a mood to accept. I know, Sir, with the brute majority they have, they can carry out any amendment whether with any reason or not. I want the Hon'ble Revenue Minister to seriously address himself and reconsider this matter. Let him convince me that this amendment is going to benefit even to 5 per cent. Sir, I have honestly given my thought and consideration. Having regard to the definition of 'person' and having regard to the provisions of sub-clause 11 of clause 2, I consider this amendment is unnecessary and in view of this I oppose this.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನೀವೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನೀವು ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ, ಎನ್ನುವಂತೆ ಇದೆ ಅವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಭೂಕ್ರಾಂತಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾದ ಮನೋದಯವನ್ನು ತಂದು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ದುಡ್ಡೆ ಬಂತೋ, ದುರ್ವ್ಯಾಧಿ ಬಂತೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ನೀವು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಹೊರಕ್ಕೆ ಬನ್ನಿ. ನೀವು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಚು ನಮಿತಿಗೂ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನಕ್ಕೂ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ಈ ಸುಧಾರಣೆವಾದ ಮನೋದಯವೇ ಸೇರೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಮೋಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರ್ವಥಾ ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಸೀಲಿಂಗಿನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ವಿವರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅಪ್ರೋಪ್ರಿಯೇಟ್ ಟೈಂ ಬಂದಾಗ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಬಾಗಿಲಿಂದ ಬಂದು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಯಿತೇ? ಇದೇಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ ನನಗೊಂದೂ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಭೂಮಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಇರುವವರಿಂದ ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿದೆಯೇ? ಖಂಡಿತ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇವರನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ ಜನಗಳ ಕಣ್ಣೊರೆಸಿ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಬಹು ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಬಾಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತರುವುದು ಇದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಸಮಾಜದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡುವಷ್ಟು ವಂಚನೆ ಈ ಜಗತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೊಂದು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಸಭೆಯು ಮುಂದೆ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟಾಗ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವಾದ ವಿವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ, ವಿಟರ್ ವಿನಮಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಇಂತಹ ಮನೋದಯ ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಯಮೆಂಟ್ ಇರುವ 148 ಹಲವು ಕಿರುನಾಲಿಗೆಗಳು, ಬೊಡ್ಡನಾಲಿಗೆಗಳು ಇರುವ ಜನಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಏಕೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಾತನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಯಮೆಂಟಿರುವ 148 ಜನರೇ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ನೀವು ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣವೋ, ಮತ್ತು ರಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿಮರ್ಶಾತ್ಮಕವಾದ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ ನೀವೋ ಆ ಪದ ಮಾತ್ಕವೇ ಒಲ್ಲ. (ನಗು).

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು. ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯೇ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಬಂದು ಕಾಂಪೈಪ್ಲೆಟ್ ಆದ ಚೆನೆಸ್ಸಿ ರಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬನ್ನಿ. Shelve this Joint Select Committee. ಎಂದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟು ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವ ಮುನ್ನ ಹೇಳಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ? ಈಗತಾನೇ ನಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಕಲ್ಕತ್ತಾಗೆ ಹೋಗಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಏನೇನೋ ನಡೆದದ್ದು ನೆನಪಿರಬಹುದು.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, I never expected that Sri Muckannappa, was capable of saying a white lie.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಇಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇವೊತ್ತು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಅಮೆಂಡು ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ತರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ? ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೈರಾಗದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜಿತ್ತಿಯವರಿಗೆ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಬಂದರೆ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ತರಕೆಳಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತೇ ? ನೀವು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಅದರಿಗೆ ತಪ್ಪಿ ಕರವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ನೀವು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ದೇವರು ಬಂಡಿತ ಒಕ್ಕೆಯದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಬಡ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಜಮೀನಿಷ್ಟು ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ? ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ರಿಲಜಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಚಾರಿಟಬಲ್ ಇನ್ ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ಸ್ ಗಳು ಎಂದು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತರುವಾಗ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗೇಕೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಜಿತ್ತಿಯವರನ್ನು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿ ಈ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲವನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ನೀವು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಾಗ ನಾವೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಿಮಗೆ ಉಪಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದೆವು. ಆಗ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಮೋಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅವರಿಂದ ಉಪಕಾರ ಪಡೆದು ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಅವರನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಮರೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈಗ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡುಮೆಂಟ್ ತರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿನೋ ಇದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸೈಂಡರೇಟ್ ಕೋಟಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿ ಹಾಕಿ ಕೊಂಡ ಅಭಿಮನ್ಯುವಿನಂತೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಂದಾಯದ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೆಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಮರುಕಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

I even pity my friend Sri Channabasappa.

I pity my others congress friends also.

ಹೀಗೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಉಪಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಹ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುತ್ತವೆಂದು ಮಾತು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಜನಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಧ್ವಂಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹೀಗೇಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದಂಥ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲ್ ಅವರು ಮತ್ತು ಡಾ. ನಾಗೂರ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಇವರು ಒಟ್ಟನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಗಳಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಔತಹ ರಿಫಾರ್ಮ್ಸ್ ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಯಾವ ಧರ್ಮ, ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್, ಪಂಜಾಬ್, ರಾಜಾಸ್ಥಾನ ಮತ್ತು ಕೇರಳ ಹೀಗೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ರಾಜ್ಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಹಾಗೆ ಕ್ರಾಂತಿಕಾರಕವಾದಂತೆ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ ? ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ನವರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹಾಗೆ ಗಾಂಧಿ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಹಿತವಾಗುವಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೇ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಗೃಹಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಆಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಕಂದಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂದ ಮೇರೆ ನೀವು ಧರ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಈ ಭೂ ಸುಧಾರಣೆಗಳ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಳವಡಿಸಿ ಜನಗಳನ್ನು ವಂಚಿಸಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈ ಹಚ್ಚಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕಳಂಕಿಯಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಮನವಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳ

ಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ಬೇಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯೇ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವವರಿದ್ದರು. ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಗುವಷ್ಟು ಉಪಕಾರ ಆಪ್ತರಲ್ಲೇ ಇದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗುವಷ್ಟು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೂ ಉಂಟು. ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಇದನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೂ ಉಂಟು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಅಡಚಿತ ಪಡೆದ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದೂ ಉಂಟು ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಯೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಮಣ್ಣು ಹಾಕಲಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ನಿಜ ವಾಗಿ ಆದರೆಂದ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ! ಎಂದಿಗೂ ಆಗಲಾರದು. ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರ, ಯಾವ ತತ್ವ, ಯಾವ ನ್ಯಾಯ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾವನೀತಿ ಇವರಿಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ರಿಲಿಜಿಯಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಚಾರಿಟಬಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಂತ ಸಾಗುವಳಿಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದವರಿಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಾಗಲೇ ಜನಗಳು ಏನು ಅಗತ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಗೇಣೀದಾರರು ಏನಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಅವರೇ ಪಳೆಯರು ತ್ಯಾನುಬೋಗರು ಇಷ್ಟು ತಕ್ಕ ಪಹಣಿರಬ್ಬಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವೇ ಸ್ವಂತವಾಗಿ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಬರೆಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸನ್ಯಾಸ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಸ್ವಂತವಾಗಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡಬೇ ಇವೆರೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನುಭವ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೇಳಿ ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ವಂಚನೆಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸ ಬೇಕು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೆಲವರು ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರು ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಸ್ವಂತ ಜಮೀನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಶ್ರೇಯೋಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯನ್ನು ಕಾಪಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರುವವರೂ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಈ ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ಸ್ವಂತ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಆಶೆಯೂ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅರ್ಥಮ್ ಎಂದಿಗೂ ಉಳಿಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾರತ ಭೂಮಿಯ ಧರ್ಮಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಕೃತಿ ಅದು ಅನೇಕಾನವಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಅದು ಎಂದಿಗೂ ಮಾಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಹೇಳಿದವರು ಇವತ್ತಿನದಿವಸ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿ ರುವುದು ಇದೇನು ಮೈನೂರು ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಜಾತಿಯ ದುರ್ದೈವವೋ ಏನೋ ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂತಹ ಧಾರ್ಮಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ದೇವರು ಮಂಜುನಾಥಸ್ವಾಮಿ ತಮಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ನೀವು ಬೇಡಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದ ರಿಂದ ಈಗಲೇ ಇದನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನೀವು ಜಿತ್ತಿ, ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲ ವನ್ನೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಅಥವಾ ನಾಳೆ ಮುಂದಿನ ಚುನಾವಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವೇ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಆಗ ಬಹುದು. ನಮಗೆ ಅದೂ ಸಂತೋಷ.

ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ನೀವು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ನನ್ನು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕಂಪಾಯಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎನಬಂದಿದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಕ್ಲಾಜು 2 ರಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿರುವ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ “Religious, Charitable or other institution capable of holding property” ಎನ್ನುವ ಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ನೀವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ತರುವುದಾದರೆ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪ್ಲನೇಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ನಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The entire object of this Bill is defeated if this explanation is added.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—As a compromise, I am suggesting to the Hon'ble Minister with the leave of the House, if he is going to omit the words "or religious and charitable or other institutions", I will agree with the amendment.

†**Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.**—On a point of order Sir, I want to know from the Chair some time back Sri M. Ramappa said that this explanation follows from explanation of personal cultivation. Now it obviously means that this is redundant and surplus. Under the rules of procedure or the convention, would you allow such an amendment which are purely there by way of clarification. It is quite clear from your statement that it is not a clarificatory amendment. What the Members have shown is that it is not necessary and surplus. Do you allow such an amendment at least let the dignity of the House be safeguarded.

Mr. SPEAKER.—This explanation is as explanation No. 3. It has come in a particular form. It has not come in a general form. It explains also, what is called 'cultivating personally'.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Item 11 is self-explanatory. The explanation is redundant Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It explains what personal cultivation means. It is given as an explanation.

†**Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.**—Sir, the Bill does not prohibit the cultivation by persons including associations, companies, co-operative societies or religious institutions, and there is no prohibition if these bodies or institutions hold lands. According to the provisions of the Bill, if these bodies should hold lands, it is within our knowledge that there are companies holding or owning lands, there are co-operative lands owning holdings and cultivating them. There are institutions like hostels which are owning lands and cultivating them through hired labour or with the help of students. The definition of personal cultivation applies not only to the persons or families, but to these institutions also. A lot of things were said about the motives with which this amendment has been tabled. It is only an explanation. The explanation is provided in the case of.....

3-00 P.M.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Minister is replying to the debate. He is not speaking on the point raised by Sri M. C. Narasimhan. The Chair must call him to order.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If there is no prohibition for these associations or bodies, what should constitute personal cultivation is a matter to be decided. In the case of families we have said 'through hired labour, personal labour or with the supervision'. But in the case of these institutions who should supervise. Supposing there is a hotel owning lands and cultivating personally. Who should do it? The manager or some employee in the case of co-operative societies who are cultivating personally should supervise; some employee of the society

and in the case of a company who should cultivate. Some companies are holding coffee estates. Take religious institutions. I was advised by the Law Department that this explanation was necessary. It does not add anything new. It is only an explanation.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What has happened to the point of order?

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order.

The House will now rise and meet again after half-an-hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Five Minutes past Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-five Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[Mr. SPEAKER in the Chair]

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ನಾನಿನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಗಿಸಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ದೇವರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ-ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕರ್ತನ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೀಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಯಾವ ಯಾವುದೋ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೇನೋ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಾಗಿ ಉಂಟು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವಂಜಪ್ಪ ನವರು ಈಗ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಖಂಡಿತ ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಲೇಗಲ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪರ್ಟ್‌ಗಳು ಈ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅವರ ತಲೆಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದರೋ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಒತ್ತಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕಿ ಈಗ ಅವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಅವರು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ವಾಪಸ್ಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri B. SHAMSUNDAR.—Sir, this amendment to the amendment or explanation to an explanation shows that the ruling party wants to undo what they originally wanted to do. The Law Department may say something, but one thing is certain. These are people who profess to be democrats, but this amendment goes against the very spirit of democracy. In the Constitution we have prescribed for ourselves so many rights and one such right is the right of equality. This amendment nullifies the entire idea of equality. We have already defined the terms "person" and "personal cultivation" and now you cannot add any explanation which will change that definition. For example take the word "woman". After defining the word, you cannot add an explanation that 'woman' means boys, girls and men. To add an explanation to a definition also there must be some guiding principle. No doubt, in this legislature you are entitled to give any explanation to any definition, but there is a limit to it. You have already defined "to cultivate personally" and "person". The definition of "person" goes to such an extent that nobody will be forced to work against his own will. So I do not know how under this definition of "to cultivate personally" you can add an explanation that he can appoint anybody

(Sri B. SHAMSUNDAR)

or hire or engage labour to work on your behalf. This is against the spirit of your Constitution. You wanted to abolish hire system *jita* system or the system of forced labour. When this country is suffering from so many disabilities, you are introducing *jita* system or the system of forced labour throughout the country. It will only help to enforce or enhance that system in this country. One of the Ministers of the Cabinet was pleased or he was kind enough, or clever enough or angry enough against his own party, that he published a book on behalf of Government, printed by the Government in the Government Press. I am referring to Hon'ble Mr. N. Rachaiah, Hon'ble Minister for Social Welfare and what not. That gentleman says that the Jeetha system is still in vogue in the country. He quotes so many cases. I do not know whether he has reported the matter to the Cabinet and if so what action has been taken. In any case, the definitions now being sought to be adopted will mislead the people of this country. These two clauses constitute the crux of the entire Bill. If you add one drop of poison to a pot of milk, will the milk be safe. By these two clauses, the entire Bill would be rendered useless.

I would draw the attention of the Hon'ble Minister to the pious resolutions passed at the Avadi conference and to the so many resolutions passed by the A.I.C.C. proclaiming to the country and to the entire world that the tillers would be made the owners of the soil. When Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru went to U.S.A. he used the opportunity to make a similar statement. But inside the country what is happening? Has that make believe succeeded? Have the tillers any hope of becoming masters of their lands? No. You are trying to prolong and perpetuate the system of forced labour. Yours is not democratic Government but a Government of the party. You are not leading this country towards democracy but towards undoubted totalitarianism. This Bill is out-dated; its effects have been worn out, its teeth have been removed.

May I ask why in a State dedicated to secularism, reference is made and protection is given to religious and charitable institutions. How can Government safeguard the interests of a particular religious section as against the interests of others? There can be no reference to religion in any document, speech or material of the Government. I am deadly against this religion, a religion which has kept us in the position of slaves all these hundreds of years, a religion which has propagated and practised the worst form of untouchability. It would be against the Constitution if the Government should function in the name of religion or should protect the interests of a few chosen people who back the party in-power. Recently in the Parliament an amendment was moved to eliminate all references to religion. We oppose not only the amendment but also these two clauses which have to be redefined. Otherwise they would not be reforms in any sense but only a powerful

instrument to put down certain sections of the people, however large in number.

† Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, while dealing with a point of order raised by Sri M. C. Narasimhan, I have already made a few observations with regard to the need for this amendment. It is well known that there are certain institutions in this State who hold properties and who are cultivating personally. If the Hon'ble Members had very closely examined the provision, there would not have been any provocation.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—On a point of explanation. Regarding holding of properties, do the words mean holding of properties under this Act or under any other enactment or custom?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I will deal with that point also. In item 29, the definition of resumable land is given. It is made clear that these institutions and bodies, whether religious or charitable or otherwise, cannot resume land from the tenants. They are capable of cultivating properties. There are several hostels in this State which are owning lands and which are cultivating the lands at present, not though tenants, but with the help of hired labour or inmates of the hostel. There are several co-operative farms who own land and who are cultivating this lands personally. Similarly, there are companies which are holding and cultivating lands. This amendment seeks to clarify as to what should constitute personal cultivation in their cases.

Sri B. SHAMSUNDAR.—The religious institutions cannot cultivate personally. The properties are on behalf of a particular religion and they are not capable of personal cultivation. The religious heads exploit others and rob properties.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—However strong may be the opinion held by the Hon'ble Member, the facts are there. At present there are some institutions which are owning properties and which are cultivating personally.

In the case of persons, it has been defined: "to cultivate personally" means to cultivate land on one's own account—(i) by one's own labour, or (ii) by the labour of any Member of one's family, or (iii) by hired labour or by servants on wages payable in cash or kind, but not in crop share, under the personal supervision of oneself or any Member of one's family". So in the case of certain associations it cannot be said that they cultivate by oneself or by the Members of the family. Therefore, to make it clear that this institutions can supervise the cultivation through their agents and employees, the amendment is moved. Several motives were attributed to me and to the ruling party. I do not want to use harsh language as is done by some Honourable Members on the other side. Words like deceit, fraud, etc. Were used. They know that elections are approaching and if these phrases or remarks please them, let them use them; I don't mind.

I do not want to attribute any motives to them. With these observations, I commend the amendment for acceptance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the amendment to the amendment, by Sri V. S. Patil. The question is :

“That (1) in Explanation III—after the words ‘capable of holding property’, the words ‘under this Act’ shall be inserted.”

“(2) The words ‘by hired labour or by servants’ shall be deleted.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put the main amendment to the House. The question is :

“That in item (11), after Explanation II, the following Explanation shall be added :—

“Explanation III.—In the case of a company, association or other body of individuals, whether incorporated or not, or a religious, charitable or other institution capable of holding property, a land shall be deemed to be cultivated personally, if such land is cultivated by hired labour or by servants under supervision by an employee or agent of such company, association, body or institution.”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 18.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That in item (12) of sub-clause (1) between the words ‘grand children’ and ‘of such person’ the words ‘and brothers, sisters and servants, if any, shall be inserted.’”

“That in item (12) of sub-clause (1) between the words ‘grand children’ and ‘of such person’ the words ‘brothers, sisters and servants if any’ shall be inserted”.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendments Nos. 19 and 20 also may be moved.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Sir, I move :

“That in item (12) of sub-clause (1) between the words ‘grand children’ and ‘of such person,’ the following words shall be inserted :—

“and dependant parents and grand parent’s”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in item (12) of sub-clause (1) between the words ‘grand children’ and ‘of such person,’ the following words shall be inserted:—

“and the dependant parents and grand parent’s.”

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I move :

“That in item (12) the words ‘and grand children’ shall be deleted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in item (12) the words ‘and grand children’ shall be deleted.”

† **Sri V. S. PATIL.**—In moving this amendment, the only thing before me is that while defining the word ‘family’ the present definition is ‘family’ in relation to a person, means such person, and if married, the wife or husband, as the case may be, and the dependent children and grand children, of such person.” Supposing ‘such person’ has got brothers and sisters. As they to be excluded from this category of family. Under the present Hindu law or the present Muslim law or parisi law or any law of inheritance, when a person dies, all the brothers and sons and daughters get practically equal and in some cases, unequal shares in the property. In such cases, if they are living together, then why the brothers and sisters are to be excluded from the definition of family.’ If they are excluded, the effect would be that each brother will be a person of his own family, each sister will be a person of her own family and thus in the case of a person who has got five or six children, after his death there will be Five or Six independent families who will be entitled to hold the ceiling per head. That means. the purpose of restricting the distribution of land will be frustrated. If we allow this clause to stand as it is, then the effect would be that the ceiling can be had by so many person in each family. That is why I have proposed that at least the blood relations along with the children, the brothers and sisters should be excluded in the word ‘family’. There is no other reason why these persons should be excluded ; otherwise to enable the landed properties persons to have different ceilings in the name of different Members of the same family and thus to defeat the very purpose for which we are enacting the limit of ceiling in this Act and so I humbly submit to the Minister in charge to accept my amendment of including at least brothers and sisters, that is, blood relations of the person concerned in the family. Or, the definition in the B-mbav Act may be taken. It reads thus : ‘Family’ includes an undivided Hindu family, and in the case of other persons a group or unit the Members of which are by custom joint in estate or residence.’ All the persons who are living together are included in a family, then the chance of getting ceiling per head in a family will be eliminated.

† **Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.**—At the out set I am expressing my objection to the introduction of the new definition of ‘family’ in item No. 12. This was not found in the original Bill and the Select Committee has not given any reason as to why it is to be given a separate meaning in item 12. The definition ‘family’ in the original Bill was the definition given in item No. 17. ‘Family’ in relation to a person, means such person and if married...I don’t want to comment upon the subsequent reference.

(Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA)

'Family' in relation to a person, means such person... Can we call a person who does not have any relations or is alone, can we call such person a family. 'Family' has been defined in various enactments for the purpose of ceiling. The Madras Act says :

"'family' means in the case of persons governed by Hindu law, an undivided Hindu family and in the case of other persons, a group or unit the members of which are by custom or usage joint in estate or residence."

So the introduction of item No. 12 'family' is a thing with cannot be reconciled and it is unwarranted so far as I could see. Because even a single person can be treated as a family. Now according to the observations made by some of our Members, it has been claimed that unmarried women and widows should be given protection by allowing them to lease out there lands. So we can treat even an unmarried woman or widow according to this definition, as a family, in which case she is entitled to have a ceiling limit. So I submit with all respect, that item No. 12 is to be deleted. Otherwise, the amendments that have been moved by Sri V. S. Patil and my amendment should be accepted, because it enlarges the scope of family. Here it restricts the husband, wife and dependent children and grand children. Supposing in a family there are aged parents or grand parents who are not capable of cultivating personally or who are not even capable of getting lands cultivated under personal supervision.

4-00 P. M.

Sir, supposing in a family there are aged parents who are not capable of cultivating personally or get the lands cultivated under personal supervision. What should happen to them? That being so, what can the grand parents do and how can they personally cultivate or personally supervise? They would be depending on their sons in the family. So, I suggest that it is desirable to include them also into the definition of family; otherwise, there is no meaning for the family. Family should be defined as in the case of persons governed by Hindu Law and undivided Hindu family. Now, the definition give large scope to make many families within the family and give scope to claim more ceiling limit for each individual family. I submit that if the Hon'ble Minister is not agreeable to delete item 12, he may kindly accept the amendment for the inclusion of parents and grand parents who are depending on their sons. No provision is made to protect them if they are not capable of personally cultivating the land. So, dependent parents and grand parents who are old may be included in that definition 'family'.

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I was wondering whether the new amendment would not lead to inconsistency. Joint Family means, in the case of persons governed by Hindu Law, an undivided Hindu

family, and in the case of other persons, a group or unit the members of which are by custom joint in estate or residence. The later portion will cover the case of non-Hindu. If you introduce this new clause, it will introduce the element of inconsistency. The moment you come to section 2 (12), you restrict the idea of family. Now, this will affect very seriously the idea of ceiling because there will be two types of ceilings. Supposing there are families covered by section 2, then they will be covered by the later portion of section 2 (17). So, if it is under 2 (17)—the later portion—they are entitled to greater amount of ceiling area. If they come under 'family', they may not be entitled to. I do not know how these two things can be reconciled. Sir, I believe that the idea of introducing this new clause which was not in the original Bill was to restrict scope of those people who come forward and claim land in excess of the ceiling. If that is so, I cannot see how grand children could be included. If grand children could be included, why not great grand children. Grand children may mean children of a son or children of a daughter. All these things arise. So, I do not think any reason to include this. That is why I suggest that this reference to grand children be deleted. Further, who is to determine his dependency? There is no particular way in which this dependency test can be applied in the case of a family. I do not think the authority can go into the question and find out whether he is dependent or not.

That difficulty also arises. The Moment he lives in the house, there is an end of the matter. Nobody can go further into the question and decide on the question whether he is really a dependant, whether a person is dependent on the income of the head of the family. I do not think a rowing enquiry can be entered into. This difficulty is also there.

†Sri M. RAMAPPA.—I would like to ask for one clarification.—whether the amendment he has sent independently and another amendment he has sent along with Sri M. C. Narasimhan—whether there is any inconsistency between them, because under 18 if it is allowed, it would give rise to the question of ceiling. If brothers, sisters and servants are included, it will help to increase the ceiling limit. If there were only five members according to the original Bill and if these people are included, it will again give rise to the increase in ceiling. I want to ask Sri Narasimhan for the deletion of grand-children, because it will result in decreasing the ceiling limit. And Sri V. S. Patil's amendment will help further in increasing the ceiling limit.

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, the Select Committee taking into consideration all the aspects just referred to by the Hon'ble Members, have come to the conclusion that the definition contained in the amended Bill is proper. My friend Sri V. S. Patil seeks to include brothers and sisters and servants in the family. 'Family' has got a legal conception. We cannot include servants in the category of the members of the family. I am submitting to the House, how can we say that the brothers should be included in the family? Supposing there are five

(Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

brothers and they are divided, and if we define that every family should include brothers and sisters who have nothing to do with the family, the result will be very disastrous. Even though one is not willing to be in the family, it is as good as saying that they should be compelled to see that they are members of the family.

Therefore, the amendment is not acceptable.

There is also the definition of 'joint family'. The Hon'ble Members know that most of the hindu families undivided families. The joint family cannot have more than the ceiling prescribed, unless the family concerned has more than 5 persons. To cover such cases of joint family, the definition of the joint family has been inserted. There is no need to accept any amendment, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put amendment No. 18.

The question is :

"That in item (12) of sub-clause (1) the words 'grand children' and 'of such person' the words 'and brothers, sisters and servants if any' shall be inserted."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in item (12) of sub-clause (1) between the words 'grand children' and 'of such person', the following words shall be inserted.

"and the dependent parents and grand parents."

The amendment was negatived.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am not pressing my amendment Sir.

The amendment was, by leave of the House withdrawn.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I beg to move :

"That in item (13) of sub-clause (1) for the word 'six' the word 'five' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That in item (13) of sub-clause (1) for the word 'six' the word 'five' shall be substituted."

†Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, this amendment is only to reduce the area of a family holding. I am not going into details, because the Hon'ble Minister may accept my amendment. At least it will affect the resumable area. It will restrict the landlord's right to the resumable area—instead of being 6 standard acres, it will be 5 standard acres. To that extent, the tenant's interests are protected. It is only from that point of view, that I have brought this definition. Now that portion survives, and I commend this amendment to the acceptance of this House.

†Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, I support this amendment moved by my Hon'ble friend Sri M. C. Narasimhan. According to the schedule given at the end of this Bill, the paddy area in our part will be double that of the standard acre. That means in our area, the family holding will be 12 acres, if it is to be 6 acres as it is in the Bill. We have got experience of cultivating our paddy lands and a family consisting of five members cannot efficiently cultivate such big extent of land; and if it is the intention of the Government and the Ruling Party to increase production of agricultural land, then I request them to accept this small but very important amendment. Dr. Nagan Gowda has just now said that even 2 acres cannot be cultivated by a family without hired labour. But we know what we are striving is not to prohibit hired labour but we want to say personal labour along with hired labour. I am not encouraging any hired labour or servants but I want to see that the owner actually cultivates, puts his efforts and manual labour into the land in order to increase the yield. If that is not done then I am afraid, in the present condition of our country, the lowest yield will continue indefinitely.

There is one more reason why this should be accepted. The Hon'ble Minister has brought in amendments somewhere—for these small holders he has prescribed 1,200 and a family should not be allowed to have much more land than what they can cultivate efficiently.

This will not only go to increase the yield but will also less occupation of lands by big people and leave more surplus lands at the hands of Government to satisfy the land hunger of the people but I think in the present circumstances the Hon'ble Minister is not free to accept anything whether it is reasonable or unreasonable, unless he is dictated to by his party. This is the most sorry spectacle in this House, but we cannot help it.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈ ದಿನ ಒಂದು ಕಂಪಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲ ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ಎನಯದಿಂದ ಪಾರ್ಥವೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಯಾವಾಗ ನಮಗೆ ಆ ಟೈಟರ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ತಾವು ಯಾವಾಗ ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾರಿಮಾಡುತ್ತೀವೆಂದು ನಿರ್ಧರಿಸಿದರೋ ಅಂದಿನಿಂದ. ತಾವು ರೈತರಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಹೋರಾಟ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಶುದ್ಧೀಕರಣ ಮಾಡಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಿನ್ನೆ 18 ಎಕರೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಇವತ್ತು 27 ಎಕರೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬಡ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಉಳುವವರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸೀಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಇಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೇ ಹೊರ್ತು ಬೇರೆ ಕನುಬು ಮಾಡುವವರ ವಿಷಯದ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಯಾವೊಂದು ಗಮನ ವನ್ನೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಕೆಲವು ನಿಬಂಧನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈರಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಕೆಲವು ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾನು ರೈತರ ಗಮನವನ್ನೂ ಮತ್ತು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನವನ್ನೂ ಸೆಳೆಯುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ದೇವರು ತಮಗೆ ಸುಬುದ್ಧಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಕಡೆಯವರು ತಂದಿದ್ದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜಿ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ)

ರಿಜೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ಕಠಿಣಪದಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಮನೂದೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳ ಅರ್ಥ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದೇ ಇರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ತಮ್ಮಂತಹ ಸಾಧು ಸಂತರಲ್ಲು ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಧು ಸತ್ಪುರುಷರಲ್ಲು ಏಕೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಪ್ಯಾಮಿಲಿ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗ್ ವಿಚಾರದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 6 ಎಕರೆ ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಐದು ಎಕರೆಯೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾವು ಪ್ರಗತಿಪರವಾದ ಬೈರಾಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ 5 ಎಕರೆಗಳ ಭೂಮಿ ಪರಿಮಿತಿ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ನೀವು 18 ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಪ್ಯೂಚರ್ ಅಕ್ಟಿಸಿಪ್ ನೀಲಿಂಗ್ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು 27 ಸ್ವಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಭಾವನೆ ತಮಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ 15 ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ರೆಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಹು ಉದಾರವಾದ ಮನಸ್ಸು ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಭೂಮಿ ಉಳುವವನಿಗೂ, ಅಪ್ಪೀಸರುಗಳಿಗೂ, ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಉಪಕಾರವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ಭೂಹೀನರಿಗೆ ತುಂಬಾ ತೊಂದರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ನಿಮಗೆ ದೇವರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾನೆಯೇ! ತಮ್ಮ ಈ ಉದಾರ ಮನಸ್ಸನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಪರಿವರ್ತನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. 6 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಂದ 5 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ಏನೋ ಬಾಯಿಂದ ಮುತ್ತು ಸುರಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಬಿಳುವುದೇನೋ ಜೊಳ್ಳೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳ ಲಕ್ಷಣ. ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿ ನೀತಿ ಧರ್ಮಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಡೆದರೆ ಅದು ಬಹಳ ಕೆಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇವರು ಬಾಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೋ ನ್ಯಾಯ, ಸತ್ಯ, ಧರ್ಮ, ನೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು, ಆದರೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವು ಯಾವುದೂ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂತಹ ದುಷ್ಕೃತ್ಯ ಬುದ್ಧಿ ಇಂತಹ ಸಾಧು ಸಂತರಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶಮಾಡಿ ಬದರಾಯನಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದಲ್ಲವೂ ಕಾನೂನಿಗೆ ರಿಲವೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶ್ಯಾಮಸುಂದ್ರ್ ಅವರು ನಮ್ಮದು ಸೆಕ್ಯೂಲರ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಆರೀತಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವಾಗ ಇಂತಹ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ರೈತರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆಗೆ ರಿಲವೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಯಿದೆಗಳಲ್ಲು ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಬೇಕು. ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಸೆರೆಗೊಡ್ಡಿ ಬೇಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈಗ 6 ಎಕರೆಗಳೆಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಐದು ಎಕರೆಗಳಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ. ಆದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ರೆಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು 15 ಎಕರೆಗಳೆಂದಿರಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಾಗ ತದ್ವಿಪರೀತಿ ಏನಿತ್ತೋ ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅದನ್ನು 18-27 ಎಕರೆಗಳೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಅದರಿಂದ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲೂ ಎಫೆಕ್ಟ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದಲೇ ನಿನ್ನೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ ದೇವರು ನಿಮಗೆ ಸುಬುದ್ಧಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಏನೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಡಿ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಬಲಗಡೆ ಕೂತು ಹೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ. ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮಗೂ, ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೂ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೂ ದೇವರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಬುದ್ಧಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿರೂ ನಮ್ಮ ಈ ತದ್ವಿಪರೀತಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ. ಸರಸ್ವತೀ ಸ್ಮರಣಪದ್ಧಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಧ್ಯಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಸೇರಿ ನೀವು ನಾಲ್ವರೂ 6 ಎಕರೆಗಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು 5 ಎಕರೆಗಳಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಬಹಳ ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ದೀನಬಂದು ಕಂಡಾಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿರಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರಲ್ಲಿ ವಾರ್ಧನೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, family holding, basic holding and ceiling area are related to each other. Yesterday we took a decision with regard to basic holding. We have decided that basic holding should be 2 standard acres. Naturally family holding will be thrice the basic holding. So there is no need to accept this amendment. I am not in favour of accepting this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“ That in item (13) of sub clause (1) for the word “ six ” the word “ five ” shall be substituted. ”

The amendment was negatived.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I beg to move :

“ That in item (15) of sub-clause (1) for the words “ which adds to the letting value of the land ” the words “ which increases the yield of the land ” shall be substituted and the words “ and consistent with the purpose for which it is held ” shall be deleted. ”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“ That in item (15) of sub-clause (1) for the words which adds to the letting value of the land ” the words “ which increases they yield of the land ” shall be substituted and the words “ and consistent with the purpose for which it is held ” shall be deleted. ”

†Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, one of the purposes of the Bill is to increase the productivity of the land as also to increase the fertility of the soil. Another aim is that we are going to abolish the relationship between the landlords and the tenants, excepting under exceptional circumstance. The third reason is that the rents are in terms of assessment in our area and the Hyderabad area. This business of ‘ letting value ’ would not survive after a few days because the question of letting will not present itself in a majority of cases except those applicable to disabled persons or under excaptional circumstances. Further on, the question to be mainly considered is whether the land has been improved in such a way that the increase in the land has really an effect on production. That should be the criterion and not the letting value. The letting value is different in different regions. In old Mysore, a system of crop-share prevails. In the Bombay and Hyderabad areas rents will be in term of assesement. If we take the letting value into account, where rent is fixed in terms of assesement, the improvements made by the tenant will not be taken into account at all. Thus a great difficulty is bound to ensure. Therefore my suggestion is that instead of considering the letting value, we should take into account the effect of the improvements on the yield. That would be appropriate and in tune with the spirit of this legislation.

Regarding the next part of my amendment, Government is not unaware that certain landlords, atleast in our part, have let lands

(Sri V. S. PATIL)

to tenants for growing certain definite crops. In some cases I have come across litigation, where the landlords have tried to evict the tenants because they improved the land for better cultivation. In one case which I knew the landlord had let the land for raising Ragi, which is a millet, which is practically worthless and which yields very little. The tenants improved the land for the purpose of planting sugarcane as well as paddy. The landlord's contention in evicting the tenant was that growing sugarcane was not the purpose for which the land was let out and so it amounts to a breach of conditions and no improvements can be made on the land. If my amendment is not to be accepted, then no improvements are possible on the land and our attempts to increase production would be thwarted. If the Government should insist on rejecting the amendment, then I have to come to the conclusion that the Government does not want and improvement on lands.

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have very closely examined the amendment tabled by my friend. The question of improvement arises when we deal with relationship between the landlord and the tenant. If the Hon'ble Member reads clause 40 and other clauses, the relevancy of this clause would be evident. I will point out that if a building is constructed on the land or if trees are grown; it would not add to the yield of the land. All the same they are also improvements. Therefore I am not in a position to accept the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is.

“That in item (15) of sub-clause (1) for the words “which adds to the letting value of the land” the words “which increases the yield of the land” shall be substituted and the words “and consistent with the purpose for which it is held” shall be deleted.

The amendment was negatived

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 23.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, I move:—

“That for item (16) of sub-clause (1) the following item shall be substituted:—

“(16) ‘intermediary’ means any person having an interest either in possession or rent of the land, between the actual cultivator and the Government.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That for item (16) of sub-clause (1) the following item shall be substituted:—

“(16) ‘intermediary’ means any person having an interest either in possession or rent of the land, between the actual cultivator and the Government.”

† Sri V. S. PATIL.—This is another provision under which the vested interest in land is trying to hoodwink the Central authority and people in general. In fact, the very purpose for which the land reforms have been forced upon this Government by the planning commission as well as by the Central Government is that the actual cultivator must be the holder under the Government; no other person should be there to intervene between the cultivator and the Government. The old conception that all lands belong to the Government is still there. Government is the real owner of the land the tiller is practically a tenant of the Government. These intermediaries have come up or have been introduced as can be seen from the history from the days of Parasuram and they are sticking like bugs or leeches to the land; they don't want to keep out of it, nor do they want to cultivate personally. That is why the yield has gone down and we are suffering and paying huge amounts to the foreign countries for the import of foodgrains. We are now trying to wipe out these intermediaries and for that purpose, my definition is quite clear. I have already stated on several occasions that agriculture is the first industry in our country which requires to be nationalised and in a very easy way.

The whole land belongs to the Government ; it is the old conception and it still holds good and if the cultivator is the tenant of the Government, then all these intermediaries should be wiped out. But here the wording is 'not being a land owner.....Why 'not being a land owner' has been inserted? Some of these terms are in vogue like Boopathi and Booswami. Do you want to perpetuate these persons. Even though adequate price is paid for their So called right, they dont want to get out.....

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—If we accept the amendment, you also become an intermediary.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I am ready to relinquish all my interests in the land. I am declaring before this House that I am going to relinquish everything in my land in favour of the tenants who cultivate the land. So I have moved this amendment. It is simple, but it has got very grave effect on the policy of the Government. As I have said on several occasions, these occupants who occupy the land or who are now deemed to be owners or whose ownership is being tried to foisted upon us, they are not real owners of the land that is why I submit that to give effect to the intention of the Planning Commission or the higher authorities in our country and to give effect to the very intention of increasing the yield and wiping out intermediaries. Land is God and why should there be intermediaries between God and devotees? My amendment should be accepted in the interests of the country and in the interests of the cultivating class.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Though the amendment looks very simple, it has got very dangerous significance or repercussion. If the idea is accepted, all the owners of lands in the State become

(Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

intermediaries. It is against the scheme of the law that we are framing and against the scheme of the existing law-Transfer of Property Act or the Land Revenue Code. Therefore, the amendment is not acceptable.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That for item (16) of sub-clause (1) the following item shall be substituted.”

“(16) ‘intermediary’ means any person having an interest either in possession or rent of the land, between the actual cultivator and the Government.”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 24. I just want to know whether the amendment is in order.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—When the term ‘joint family’ has been defined, automatically ‘divided family’ must follow. Before you decide about admitting it or not, I will explain the situation.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ admissible ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಹಿ. ಎ. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ನನಗೆ ಕೊಂಚ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ವಿಷಯ explain ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಅನೇಕ Complications ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಅರ್ಧ ವಿವರಣೆಗಾಗಿ ಟ್ರಬ್ಲ್ಯೂನರ್ ಮುಂದೆ ಗಲಾಟೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ Joint family define ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ divided family ಬಂದೇ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಜನ ವಿಭಾಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರು ವಿಭಾಗ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ರಿಜಿಸ್ಟರ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿರಬಹುದು, ಬರೀಪಾಲು ಪಟ್ಟಿ ಬರೆದು ಕೊಂಡಿರಬಹುದು, ಅಥವಾ ಕಂದಾಯ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತ ಅನುಭವಿಸುತ್ತಿರಬಹುದು ಮೂಗರ್ಜಿ ಬರೆಯುವವರು, ಪುಡಾರಿಗಳು ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ವಿಭಾಗ ವಾಗ್ಗಿವೆಂದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಮುಳುಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತಾರೆ ಅವರು ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಶ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಲಿಖಿತ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ರೈತ ಹಾಳಾಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಇಂಥವು ಎಷ್ಟು ನಡೆದು ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಂಸಾರಗಳು ಹಾಳಾಗಿವೆ ? ಅವರೇ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೂ ನಡೆಸಿರಬಹುದು ಇರುವ ವಿಚಾರ ವನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನೂ ಅಡ್ಡಿಯಿಡಬೇಡಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಬೇಡ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—“Divided family” ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಬರುವವಕಾರಣ ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವಂತಿಲ್ಲ Item No. 25.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, I beg to move :

“That in item (21) of sub-clause (1) between the words “means” and “an owner” the words “for the purpose of this Act” shall be inserted.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

“That in item (21) of sub-clause (1) between the words “means” and “an owner” the words “for the purpose of this Act” shall be inserted.”

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, the main purpose why I have brought this amendment is, according to item 21, land owner means an owner of land and includes a trustee or mortgagee with possession thereof;

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I would like to bring to the notice of my friend that the section itself begins as 'In this Act.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes. I think this redundant. It may be with drawn.

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn

Sri K. MALLAPPA.—Sir, I do not propose to move my amendment to item 22.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA. Item.—(23) Sir, I beg to move :

"That in item (23) (d), for the words "mulgenidar or mirasdar" the words 'mulgenidar mirasdar or khata kul' be shall substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That in item (23) (d), for the words 'mulgenidar or mirasdar' the words 'mulgenidar, mirasdar or khata kul' shall be substituted."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, this is a simple amendment. This is in the Bombay Act and other Acts. It is a different name to mulgenidar in Bombay.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That in item (23) (d), for the words 'mulgenidar or mirasdar' the words 'mulgenidar, mirasdar or khata kul' shall be substituted."

The amendment was adopted.

Sri K. MALLAPPA (Mercara).—I do not propose to move the amendment to item (25).

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I beg to move ;

"That in item (25) of sub-clause (1) the word 'Cinchoua' shall be added at the end."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That in item (25) of sub-clause (1) the word 'Cinchona' shall be added at the end."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, cinchona has not been included in the category of plantation because cinchona plantation are very few and very small extents-5 to 10 acres. The ceiling provided in the schedule is too big enough to cultivate cinchona. Therefore, Government feel that there is no need to include cinchona.

† Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Minister does not seem to know that this cinchona plantation can convert itself into a beautiful agricultural industry. To-day, there is dearth for quinine in the hospitals. Merely because within the Mysore State there is no big plantation of cinchona, it does not mean that there is no plantation of more than 20 acres. It is universally accepted as a plantation crop. Sir, this Government's chief source of inspiration is either from the Law Department or their Planning Commission. Cinchona has been accepted universally as plantation crop. What is the objection on behalf of the Government? Let the Hon'ble Minister get up and say that he is not prepared to accept any amendment however reasonable it may be, we will go away. I want to know what is the inseparable difficulty or major objection to accept cinchona as a plantation crop.

5-00 P.M.

After all, there is definition of 'plantation crop.' I said, please include cinchona. Let the objection put forward be a little reasonable. I shall myself withdraw the amendment.

† Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, I do not know why such a simple amendment is opposed. As my Hon'ble friend has just now said, it is recognition of plantation crop.....

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Where?

† Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—You will see that practically in every definition of plantation crop, cinchona is included. Now we know it is only Government farms that grow cinchona. But why should you prevent or why should you not visualise a state where it can be cultivated independently and privately? If the Government wants, there are persons who want to take up cinchona cultivation as an industry. Why should we prevent that? This does not affect anybody at present. But I am trying to tell you that there are a few persons who want to come forward and have plantations in vast areas if Government wants, because it is an industry which can be encouraged. We have got a dearth for quinine at present in all medical institutions. Why should we not have such industries, if there are people who can come forward. It is possible, people may come forward, as soon as we have included this in plantation crop. That is why we have proposed this amendment.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I do not attribute any motives. I simply said that there are very few cinchona plantations at present even if it is to be included under plantation. Further, the Government itself is growing cinchona plants for medicinal purposes. If there is need, we will include growing cinchona plantations.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Do you want that also to be a public enterprise. It is something which is very new. Why should you prevent private people from growing cinchona. I am making a suggestion to the Government. Ignorance is bliss where is folly to be wise!

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I consider Mr. Mallaradhya to be wiser than me. Sir, the ceiling is very high. In the case of dry lands where cinchona can be planted, the ceiling goes up from 180 to 216 acres. In the case of joint families, from 216 to 432 acres. Any body who is interested in growing cinchona can grow in their own lands. Why should they be exempted. At present, the Government itself is growing cinchona.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That in item (25) of sub-clause (1) the word ‘Cinchona’ shall be added at the end”

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 29.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

That after item (25) the following shall be added as item (25A).

“Plantation” means any land used by a person principally for the cultivation of tea, coffee, rubber, cinchona or cardamom or such other kind of special crops as may be specified by Government by notification in the Gazette and includes--

- (a) Land used by such person for any purpose ancillary to the cultivation of such crops or for the preparation of the same for the market.
- (b) Land contiguous to or in the vicinity of or within the boundaries of the area cultivated with such crops not exceeding twenty per cent of the area so cultivated and reserved by such person and fit for the expansion of such cultivation.
- (c) Agricultural lands interspersed within the boundaries of the area cultivated by such person with such crops not exceeding such extent as may be determined by Government as necessary for the protection and efficient management of such cultivation.

Explanation I : Lands used for the construction of office buildings, godowns, factories, quarters for workmen, hospitals, schools and playgrounds shall be deemed to be lands used for the purposes of sub-clause (a).

Explanation II: If any question arises as to whether any land is in the vicinity of or within the boundaries of the area cultivated for the purposes of sub-clause (b) or whether it is reserved and fit for the expansion of cultivation, it shall be determined by the Government.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:—

“That after item (25) the following shall be added as item (25A).

‘Plantation’ means any land used by a person principally for the cultivation of tea, coffee, rubber, cinchona or cardamom or such other kind of special crops as may be specified by Government by notification in the Gazette and includes—

- (a) Land used by such person for any purpose ancillary to the cultivation of such crops or for the preparation of the same for the market.
- (b) Land contiguous to or in the vicinity of or within the boundaries of the area cultivated with such crops not exceeding twenty per cent of the area so cultivated and reserved by such person and fit for the expansion of such cultivation.
- (c) Agricultural lands interspersed within the boundaries of the area cultivated by such person with such crops not exceeding such extent as may be determined by Government as necessary for the protection and efficient management of such cultivation.

Explanation I: Lands used for the construction of office buildings, godowns, factories, quarters for workmen, hospitals, schools and playgrounds shall be deemed to be lands used for the purposes of sub-clause (a).

Explanation II: If any question arises as to whether any lands is in the vicinity of or within the boundaries of area cultivated for the purposes of sub-clause (b) or whether it is reserved and fit for the expansion of cultivation, it shall be determined by the Government.”

Sri J. B. MALLABADHYA.—Sir, I do not know why the Select Committee in their wisdom under the leadership of the Hon’ble Minister for Revenue forgot to define what plantation means. Whether it is in the Kerala Bill or the Madras Bill or any other Bill which refers to plantation, they have given very exhaustive definition of plantations. To avoid future complications, it is not sufficient if you merely define the words plantation crop and stop at that. I think there would be a notable omission if you do not include a very exhaustive definition of ‘plantation’. That is the object with which I have brought this definition. There are other States which have followed this definition and I should think there can be no objection on the part of the Hon’ble Minister for Revenue to accept this definition.

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, after listening to the observations made by the Leader of the Opposition when the Report was being considered and speeches of some Hon’ble Members, Government have decided

to amplify and give a detailed explanation on the lines suggested by Sri Mallaradhyha except slight modifications. We want to insert this in the Chapter relating to exemptions. This is more or less the same that was suggested by the Hon'ble leader—the land used by such persons ancillary to cultivation, etc. Lands contiguous to or in the vicinity or within the boundaries of the area cultivated with such crops not exceeding 20 acres. We will put a limit up to 100 acres. Then "Agricultural lands interspersed within the boundaries of the area cultivated by such persons with such crops not exceeding the ceiling area."

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I did not expect that I should have to make a speech.

ಒಂದು ನೂರು ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಶೇಕಡ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟರವರಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಆರ್ಡರ್‌ನೇ ಇಲ್ಲ ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೂ ಅವರೇಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇರಳದ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಒಂದೂವರೆ ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟರವರ ಬಳಿ ಇದ್ದು ಅಲ್ಲಿದ್ದ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪರ್ಜಿಸ್‌ಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿ ಕನಿಷ್ಠವಾಗಿ ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟಿವ್‌ವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಒದ್ದುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ದೊಡ್ಡದಾಗಿ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. What is the objection to accept this definition? ಇವನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕಿರುವ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾದರೂ ಏನು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅದು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತು. ಈಗ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಕಂಪನಿಗಳೆಲ್ಲ 5,000-6,000 ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್ನುಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಫಿಗಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತರಷ್ಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ. ಹಾಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸಣ್ಣ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರನವರ ಎಂದರೆ ಸುಮಾರು 20 ಎಕರೆಯಷ್ಟು ಕಾಫಿ ತೋಟವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿ, ಅದರಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There should be some sanctity attached to the President's Orders in respect of similar provision in the Kerala Bill. ನಾನು ಕೂಡ ಪ್ರೆಸಿಡೆಂಟರವರ ಆರ್ಡರ್‌ನ್ನು ಮಕ್ಕಿ ಕಾ ಮಕ್ಕೀ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. Contiguous to or in the vicinity of, or within the boundaries of the plantation area not exceeding 20% ಹೀಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಏನು ಸ್ವಾಮಿ?

Do you mean to suggest that the President and his Advisers did not have in view the companies referred to by the Hon'ble Minister? I am sorry that the Government has not taken into consideration the full aspects connected with plantation. Even with the existence of my friend like Sri K. Mallappa, who is himself a planter, I do not know why wise counsel does not prevail with the Revenue Minister? ಅವರೇನು ತಮಗೆ ಹೇಳಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಭೂನುಧಾರಣೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? ನನಗೇನು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನೇ ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ತಿಮ್ಮಪಡಿ ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ, ಅದು ಹೀಗಿದೆ. Agricultural lands interspersed within the plantation area and necessary for the efficient management of the plantation with a proviso inserted in a suitable place in the Bill.....

(Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA)

ಹೀಗೇಕೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನಿಲ್ಲ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ? If it is the intention that the tenant should not be shifted or you should not resume that land, that applies and that restriction should operate..... ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್‌ನೊಳಗೆ ಭತ್ತ ಬೇಳೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೀಲಿಂಗು ಲಿಮಿಟು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಾ, ಹೇಗೆ? A suitable explanation of the expression "land ancillary to the cultivation of such crops" should be added.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಡಿ. ಜತ್ತಿ.—ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ವ.ತು ಈಗ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಏನು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಪೆಸಿಡೆಂಟರ ಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಕಾಗದವೂ ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈಗ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಸ್ವಾರ್ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗರಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಶೇಕಡ ಇಪ್ಪತ್ತರಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಎರಡು ಎಕರೆ ಗಳಷ್ಟು ಕೂಡ ಸಿಗುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಒಂದು ನೂರು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಮಿತಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ 1,000 ಎಕರೆ ಗಳಷ್ಟು ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅದರೊಳಗೆ ನೂರು ಎಕರೆ ಎಂದರೆ ವಿಪರೀತವಾಗಿ ಏಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನೂರು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಲಿಮಿಟು ಹಾಕುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಭತ್ತ ಬೇಳೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಸೀಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಹಾಕ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, In any case it should not exceed one ceiling area.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಪ್ಲಾಂಟರುಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್ ಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್ ಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರ ಡೆಫಿನಿಷನ್ ನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದೇನು ಆಕಾಶ ಕಳಚಿ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೇನು? There is no such apprehension. ಸ್ವಾರ್ ಪ್ಲಾಂಟರುಗಳು ಒಬ್ಬರೇ ತಮ್ಮ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲರಬೇಕೇನು? ಪ್ಲಾಂಟೇಷನ್ ಇಂಟ್ರಿಯನ್ನು ಇವತ್ತು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ನಿಮಗೆ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಆಸೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಈಗ ನಾನು ಹೇಳು ತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನಿರ್ವಿವಾದವಾಗಿದೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore city).—It is an advantage to the planter.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We have agreed in principle. We will put it in the Chapter relating to Exemptions

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎಂ. ಬಸವಗೌಡ (ಚಿಕ್ಕಮಗಳೂರು).—ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೂರು ಎಕರೆಯಷ್ಟು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಟೆಂಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಇದು ಕಂಪನಿಯನ್ನು ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಟೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಎಕರೆ ಗಳು ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮೊದಲು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು? ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಂಪನಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಆಗು ತ್ತದೆ? ಮದರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In plantation industry, Mysore leads and you want to put us back. You want us to suffer at the expense of what is done in Kerala and Madras?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನೇ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. 25 ಎಕರೆಯಷ್ಟು ಎಂದು ಸ್ವಾರ್ ಹೋಲ್ಡಿಂಗಿಗೆ ಎಂದು ಇರಬಹುದು. In Coorg and Chickmagalore, I have seen hundreds of plantations.

Sri A. M. BASAVEGOWDA.—Not even $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಎಕರೆಗಳಿಗಿಂತ 900 ಎಕರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುವಂತಹ ಕೇಸುಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟು ಇವೆ. ಸ್ವಾರ್ ಹೋಲ್ಡರುಗಳು ಎಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ 26 ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಅಥವಾ 50 ಎಕರೆಗಳು ಎನ್ನುವಂತಹ ಎಷ್ಟಿವೆ? ಅದರ ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳಿವೆಯೇನು? ಒಂದು ಸಾವಿರ ಎಕರೆಗಳಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಾಂಟೇಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ 900 ಎಕರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇರುವಂತಹ ಪ್ರಾಂಟೇಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟಿವೆ?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—You have said that whether it is fit for cultivation or not shall be decided by Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If this is not pressed now, the emergency can be solved.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In view of the assurance given by the Revenue Minister I am not pressing this amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, of the House withdrawn

Mr. SPEAKER.—Next amendment No. 30 stands in the name of Sri Venkatai Gowda. He is not present. Amendment No. 31 may be moved.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I beg to move:

“That in item (27) for the words ‘twelve years’ the words ‘one years’ shall be substituted and after the words ‘prior to’ the words ‘and including’ shall be added.”

Mr SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That in item (27) for the words ‘twelve years’ the words ‘one years’ shall be substituted and after the words ‘prior to’ the words ‘and including’ shall be added.”

† Sri V. S. PATIL.—The main purpose of my amendment is to reduce the 12 year period because it is too long. This period seems to have been adopted from the Bengal Tenancy Act of 1850. This period was fixed more than hundred years ago and should have no validity now. My amendment would have the effect that if the tenant is cultivating one year before the appointed day, he should be deemed to be a protected tenant. There should not be any distinction or divisions of tenants into various categories. I wish to submit that our Hindu society has been divided into several groups which has ruined the society. As far as possible we should classify these people on one and the same level, which would be in the interests of society. The divide-and-rule policy should not be practised in this age when we are devoted to the creation of a socialist pattern. In order to avoid further divisions amongst tenants it would be more equitable and it would ensure greater harmony among tenants, if my amendment is accepted.

†SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—According to the scheme of the Bill, a distinction has been made between the protected tenant and an ordinary tenant. The protected tenant is given some special privileges. If a person is a protected tenant he should be left atleast with a basic holding according to Clause 16. In the case of an ordinary tenant that privileges does not accrue. Hence I oppose the amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That in item (27) for the words ‘twelve years’ the words ‘one years’ shall be substituted and after the words ‘prior to’ the words ‘and including’ shall be added.”

The amendment was negatived.

Sri B. G. KHOT (Sadalsa).—I beg to move :

In item (27) of sub-clause (1) the Explanation (3) be substituted as follows:—

“Where any land is held by two or more persons jointly as tenants all such persons who cultivate such land personally shall be deemed to be protected tenants in respect of such land.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That in item (27) of sub-clause (1) the Explanation (3) be substituted as follows:—

“Where any land is held by two or more persons jointly as tenants all such persons who cultivate such land personally shall be deemed to be protected tenants in respect of such land.”

†Sri B. G. KHOT.—My amendment is simple. It has been brought with a practical point of view. A person who actually cultivates the land should be in possession of the land. According to the provisions of the bill even if a person is not cultivating the land he can be deemed to be a protected tenant. *Prima facie* it will be against the interest of the tenants. The clause as it exists now confers an undue advantage. Justice should be met out to both the parties, the landlord and the tenants. If we read clause 25, it is clear that the analogy would result in injustice. I am not coming in the way of any privilege or right of any tenant but justice ought to be done to both. If the tenant surrenders the right willingly, why should he be given this undue and unjust privilege. Any person cultivating the land should have the rights of a protected tenant. That also stands to common sense and I hope the Minister would accept my amendment as modified.

5-30 P.M.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—The amendment is not acceptable. It is to the disadvantage of the tenant.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will put Sri Khot's amendment as modified by him. The question is:

"That in item (27) of sub-clause (1) the Explanation (3) be substituted as follows:

"Where any land is held by two or more persons jointly as tenants all such persons who cultivate such land personally shall be deemed to be protected tenants in respect of such land."

The amendment was negatived.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment No. 35.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I would like to know from my friend Sri V. S. Patil whether it is necessary. Even as it is, it is to the advantage of the tenants. It is wider than Clause 5.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I am just explaining the matter to the Minister. We have not defined 'disability' anywhere in this Bill. So a person who goes to Calcutta or Delhi and resides there, even that may come to be interpreted to be a disability. Some difficulty will crop up in the courts while interpreting the words. That is why I have tried to make the definition of 'disability' as covered in section 5. If it appears reasonable, I will move it.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is left to him, but according to me, the wording in the clause is more advantageous to the tenants.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—All right; I do't move this amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The next amendment (No. 36) stands in the name of the Hon'ble Minister.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I move:

"That in item (29) of sub-clause (1)—

(i) for the first proviso, the following proviso shall be substituted,

"Provided that in respect of land held on lease on the appointed day,

(i) land leased to a permanent tenant by any person; and

(ii) land leased to any tenant by a company, association or other body of individuals (not being a joint family), whether incorporated or not, or by a religious, charitable or other institution capable of holding property,

shall be deemed to be non-resumable land ;"

(ii) in the second proviso, for the words 'a small holder', the words 'a small holder, a widow or an unmarried woman' shall be substituted."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That in item (29) of sub-clause (1)—

(i) for the first proviso, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:—

“Provided that in respect of land held on lease on the appointed day,

“(i) land leased to a permanent tenant by any person; and

“(ii) land leased to any tenant by a company, association or other body of individuals (not being a joint family), whether incorporated or not, or by a religious, charitable or other institution capable of holding property, shall be deemed to be non-resumable land.”

(ii) in the second proviso, for the words “a small holder” the words ‘a small holder, a widow or an unmarried woman’ shall be substituted.”

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—This is a simple modification I have suggested. Item No. 29 is concerned with ‘resumable land’. The effect of this amendment is that land leased to a permanent tenant, land leased to any tenant by a company, association or other a religious institution shall become non-resumable. That means they will be prevented from evicting the tenant or resuming the land. With this object I have tabled this amendment. The amendment is suggested is to exclude joint families because joint families are not debarred from resuming the land for personal cultivation. The other associations or bodies are prohibited from resuming the land. In the other item I propose to insert ‘widows and unmarried women’. Because there was a lot of criticism from Hon’ble Lady Members. The Select Committee was not-right in deleting these two categories.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That in item (29) of sub-clause (1)—

(i) for the first proviso, the following proviso shall be substituted, namely:—

“Provided that in respect of land held on lease on the appointed day,

(i) land leased to a permanent tenant by any person; and

(ii) land leased to any tenant by a company, association or other body of individuals (not being a joint family), whether incorporated or not, or by a religious, charitable or other institution capable of holding property,

shall be deemed to be non-resumable land.”

(ii) in the second proviso, for the words “a small holder” the words ‘a small holder, a widow or an unmarried woman’ shall be substituted.”

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is another amendment.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I move:

“That for item (31), the following item shall be substituted, namely:

“(31) ‘small holder’ means a land owner owning land not exceeding two basic holdings whose total annual net income including the income from such land does not exceed Rs. 1,200.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

“That for item (31), the following item shall be substituted, namely:

“(31) ‘small holder’ means a land owner owning land not exceeding two basic holdings whose total annual net income including the income from such land does not exceed Rs. 1,200.”

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I wish to move an amendment to the amendment. I move:

“That in item (31) the words ‘whose total annual net income including the income from such land does not exceed Rs. 1,200 occurring in the end shall be deleted.’”

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment to the amendment moved:

“That in item (31) the words ‘whose total annual net income including the income from such land does not exceed Rs. 1,200, occurring in the end shall be deleted.’”

“Items (37), (38), (39), (40) and (41) have a bearing on the same point. If the present amendment is accepted, they will be barred.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ರಾಮಪ್ಪ.—ನಮಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಕಾಮಿಗಳನ್ನೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲವಲ್ಲ? ನಮಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವೇ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It is a very simple amendment that a ‘small holder’ means a person who owns land not exceeding two basic holdings whose annual net income from the land does not exceed Rs. 1,200.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.—ಐದು ಸ್ವಾಯಂಧರ್ಯ ಎಕರೆ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಆಗಿದೆ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಅಂಗೀಕೃತವಾದರೆ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಸೊಚಿಸಿದಂತಹ ಇತರ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಸ್ಪದವಿರಲಾರದು. ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು.

†Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—During the general discussions on the Report of the Joint Select Committee, it was suggested by several Honourable Members on this side and that side too that the extent of land to be held by a small holder is too small and it should be increased. With due deference to their wishes, I have tabled this amendment.

(Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA)

With regard to the amendment tabled by my friend Sri Mallaradhya to the amendment I have proposed, I wish to submit one thing. The idea is, all of us think in terms of helping the poor man; a small holder is just in no way better than the tenant. I have suggested that his total income should be not more than Rs. 1200 per annum. Supposing as suggested by Mr. Mallaradhya we delete the later portion of the clause. Then what happens is, factory owners, industrialists, bankers, big businessmen all can partition their properties among the children, grand children, brothers and sisters and every one of them becomes a small holder and they will be entitled to the privileges conferred on the small holder. Therefore if the intention of the House is to help the small holder who deserves our sympathy, I appeal to the House to accept the amendment.

†Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, I wish to say a few words. There seems to be a lot of confusion and misconception with regard to this definition I do not know whether the Government have different standards and yard-sticks to measure land reform. I should like to bring to the notice of this House a few things which the Planning Commission themselves have stated.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—We have seen all that.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I am very glad that Government have seen it. I will only refer to the relevant passage.

“It is considered that except for owners holding land equivalent to a family holding or less, in view of the period which has already elapsed, there should be no further right of resumption. Further uncertainty for tenants would not be in the interest of agricultural development. In the second place, small owners, that is, owners with a family holding or less, deserve special consideration. As suggested in the Second Plan, owners with less than a basic holding (that is, one-third of a family holding) should be free to resume their entire area for personal cultivation and to lease out their lands. As regards owners whose holdings lie between a basic holding and a family holding they may be permitted to resume for personal cultivation, within a specified period, one-half of the area held by the tenant but in no event less than a basic holding. Where a tenant is left without any land or with area smaller than a basic holding the Government should endeavour to find land for him to cultivate. The general aim should be to encourage small owners, and specially those among them with very small holdings, to enter into co-operative farmings societies. Membership in a co-operative farming society would enable them to move to other work if they so desire.”

"It is recommended that in the course of the Third Plan steps should be taken to complete the programme for conferring rights of ownership on the tenants of non-resumable lands: With the enforcement of ceilings on agricultural holdings: tenants of owners with lands above the limit of ceiling will, in the ordinary course, become owners of land."

"The question arises whether rights of ownership should also be conferred upon the tenants of small owners. This would be desirable in principle to the extent of non-resumable lands held by such tenants. However, in view of the large number of petty owners involved, a uniform approach might not be feasible. The problem should be studied by States in the light of their conditions with a view to determining the action called for in this direction."

That is all the recommendation of the Commission. They have not stated in regard to income, derived from any source. There is not a single word about the factory owner's business. This seems to be a bug-bare of the Government. Sir, we are not holding any special brief for those people. Let us see whether this is a uniform policy which is followed in all States. Take the case of a small owner. He is entitled to resume two acres. He is not allowed to resume the other two acres. He must cultivate these two acres of land and get the rent from the other two acres. The utmost that he can do is, resume two acres and lease out the other two acres or lease out all the four acres. The income allowed is Rs. 1,200. Let us take a peon in the Central Government. He gets not less than Rs. 100 a month. For that matter, any peon in the offices in Bangalore; they get not less than Rs. 100. If the petty shop-keeper has an income of Rs. 1,200, he wishes to be a owner. The vast majority of persons are not persons contemplated by Government; they are somebody else. Even if he gets an income of 2 or 3 rupees from other sources, he ceases to be a small owner. The main objective of the Government is to raise the living standard. Even the Five Year Plan says, he can enter into co-operative society or follow some other avocation and get more than 1,200. Sir, let us take the case of a coffee planter. He may be a man getting a few lakhs of rupees income and he is allowed to have hundreds of acres. He can resume land up to a ceiling and he can lease out the land. But we are against these people and we want them only to get two acres. Sir, is there any such definition anywhere? Even in the Kerala Bill, I have not been able to find any such restriction on the small holder. The Revenue Minister seems to have read everything. He said 5 acres is the holdings for a small holder in Kerala; it is not so; it is 10 acres.

Sir, those persons who have land exceeding ten acres are not small holders. Up to ten acres, they are small holders. Sir, the Hon'ble Minister read into this Clause some meaning and said that it applies

(Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY)

only to persons having 5 acres. I know a little bit of English. I am unable to find that meaning in this section. I am really unhappy to say that in this particular case I do not know, there is some opposition in the mind of Government. Why is this opposition, I am unable to understand. This is with regard to both the Revenue Minister and the Chief Minister I am saying. We know big landlords go scot free. Why are you not worried about persons who are away with 1,000 acres? Why are you obsessed with persons having only four acres. Are we barring tenancies altogether? Let us take the case of an army man he can lease out his land. A Widow can lease out land: an unmarried girl can lease out land; an insane person can lease out lands. Therefore, you will kindly see that leasing land is not altogether barred at all. So, it is in this particular case in certain areas, very large number of people are small holders. Tenancy is given perpetually. Now we have seen temples and muts are allowed to cultivate vast areas of land. I can challenge, you cannot resume 1,000 acres of land before the appointed day. God alone knows when this appointed day comes. Because in Kerala, they took one or one year and a half to get this legislation passed. Before the appointed day comes, every must and every institution can get thousands of acres of land and they will get the lands cultivated through servants. Small holders farm a very large majority of the people. They can follow some vocation and they can get a little income from this land. I am not saying all lands should be resumed from the tenants. I do not know even in Kerala Bill such a provision has been inserted. I do not find it in any other Bill. In the earlier amendment, I find that it should be the main source of income. Now it is total income that is suggested. What is it? My humble appeal to the Government is let us not have such opinions about poor people. It may be clerks, they may be anybody. Let them take any action they want to prevent people from resuming lands. Let them take any action against division of lands, with regard to very big people,—bankers and industrialists. But I am concerned with small holders here. I appeal again to the Government to treat these people sympathetically so that there should not be any hardship at a later stage. As I said, it is nowhere suggested in the Planning Commission Report. It is a peculiar thing. Let the Government at least reconsider their decision when they are trying to bring about this very big amendment.

Sri F. X. DENIS PINTO.—Even landlords hold one basic holding he cannot resume it. Are you for removing that restriction?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have tabled certain other amendments. You must hear me completely. Then you can get the reply. To cover such cases, I have tabled other amendments.

† Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I do not know why Government is shifting ground from day to day. What I am saying is, in addition to

what my friend Sri V. Srinivasa Shetty has said. I want to invite the attention of the House to the definition on basic holding. You said two standard acres. We said five acres. In the amendment, you want 4 standard acres. I want to know five acres should not be accepted. Is there any major objection to one more standard acre? It looks very funny that Government should take such a harsh view in the case of small holders. Is this the way you encourage intensive cultivation?

ಸಣ್ಣ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರರ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆಯೇ ನಮ್ಮ ಅಂತಿಮ ಧ್ಯೇಯ, ನಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸಮತಾ ಸಮಾಜವಾದದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವರು, ಈ ಸಣ್ಣ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರರ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ತಿಮ್ಮಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದು ನಾಲ್ಕು ಎಕರೆ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಸಣ್ಣ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರನು ತಾನು ಬುದ್ದಿ ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾನೆಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳ, ಅವನಿಗೆ 1,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಪರಿಮಿತಿ ಏಕೆ ಹಾಕ ಬೇಕು? ಐದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಅದರಿಂದ 1,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬರದೆ ಇರಬಹುದು. Is this the way you encourage intensive cultivation? ನನಗೆ confusion ಇರಬಹುದು, ಅರ್ಥವಾಗದೇ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಎಕರೆ ಬಿಡುವುದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆ ಏನು? ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಜಮೀನ್ದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಂತ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಭೂಮಿಯನ್ನು ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಉಳಿದವರನ್ನು ಏಕೈಕವರಿಗೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತೇವೆನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಬೇಕೋ ಅಂಥ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಂದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಅಕ್ಷರಶಃ ಸಣ್ಣ ಹಿಡುವಳಿದಾರನನ್ನು ವಪಸಿಗೆ ಏನೂ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದಂತಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಜವಾನನು ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದು ತಾನೇ, ಅವನಿಗೆ 25 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಂಬಳ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವನಿಗೆ ಮಂದಗದ್ದೆ ಹೋಬಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮೀನಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಅಂಥವನಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಐದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ ಪರಭಾರೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾನೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡ ಐಶ್ವರ್ಯವಂತನಾಗುತ್ತಾನೆ, ಎಂದು ಹೆದರಿಕೆಯೇ? ಜವಾನಗಿರಿ ಮಲ್ಲುರವ ಕಿರುಕುಳವನ್ನು ಸಹಿಸಲಾರದೆ, ಆ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವನು ತನ್ನ ಊರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಐದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ, ಅದನ್ನು ನಂಬಿಕೊಂಡು ಬೀವನ ಮಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಐದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನು ಇರಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ? ಇಡೀ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಐದು ಎಕರೆಗಿಂತ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಇರುವವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಇದ್ದಾರೆನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ನೀವು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಐದು ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಗಳು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಹೌದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ನಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾದ ಐದು ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿರುವವರು ಶೇಕಡ 50 ರಷ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ರಾಜ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ನಾವು ಮೊದಲೇ ಸ್ಟಾಂಡರ್ಡ್ ಎಕರೆಯ ಅರ್ಥ ವಿವರಣೆ ಯನ್ನು dispute ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದು ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರೀಯವಲ್ಲ. ವೈಜ್ಞಾನಿಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ನೀವು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಕುರುಡು ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರ ಎಂದು ಮೊದಲನೆಯೇ ಟೀಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು hair split argument ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ.